The Pittsburgh Gazette

Vol. XVII. *Friday Evening*, October 22, 1802. No. 84.

PITTSBURGH: PRINTED BY JOHN SCULL, *IN FRONT-STREET, NEXT DOOR TO THE CORNER OF MARKET-STREET.*

Terms of Subscription for the PITTSBURGH GAZETTE.—*Two Dollars a year—One Dollar to be paid at the time of subscribing, the other at the end of Six months, if demanded [When sent by post the postage must be paid in addition, at the Post-Office where the papers are left.]*

ADVERTISEMENTS—*not exceeding a square inserted three weeks for One Dollar, and every continuance after 25 Cents.—Those of a greater length in proportion.*

*** Those persons in arrears for subscription for the Pittsburgh Gazette, are particularly requested to make immediate payment. The repeated calls heretofore made have been but partially attended to. The Editor hopes that those who know themselves in arrears, will either pay the balance due to the Post-Masters at whose Offices their papers are left, or transmit it to him. If this request is not attended to, the most summary means will be pursued to compel payment, for it is only a waste of paper and time to supply subscribers who do not pay.

Scott & Trotter,

BEG leave to inform their friends and former customers that they have just received and opened in the House they lately occupied, Market street, a large assortment of

MERCHANDIZE,

suitable to the present and approaching season, which they are determined to sell low for Cash, or approved of Country Produce.

Pittsburgh, October 8 1802.

WAX WORK.

To be exhibited by Mr. and Mrs. CRITE, lately from the City of Baltimore,

WHO most respectfully present their compliments to the Ladies and Gentlemen of Pittsburgh and its vicinity, and inform them that they intend EXHIBITING, at the house of Mr. JOHN REED, Innkeeper, in Pittsburgh, from the 15th inst. until the 6th of November next, an elegant and extensive Collection of

WAX WORK FIGURES,

AS LARGE AS LIFE,

Which are acknowledged by those who have seen them in the principal cities throughout the United States, to be equal, if not superior, in their beauty, and near approach to real life, to any that have ever been exhibited in this country. Among the number are the following characters, which the proprietor flatters himself will be found (by those who have seen the Original) to be both natural and striking in their representations; and he hopes that every spectator will be satisfied with the foregoing of the Figures, and with the efforts of Art, which have been used to imitate Nature, viz.

Doctor Benjamin Franklin, Governor Mifflin, his Lady, and Two Children, the Grenadier that saved his life in the Council of Five Hundred; Voltaire; the late Queen and Queen of France; Princess Elizabeth of France; King and Queen of England; Prince and Princess of Wales, the Sleeping Beauty and Prince being Beauty, the Old Batchelor and Old Maid, &c. with several other distinguished persons.

Price of Admittance—For grown persons 25 Cents; Children, half price.

The whole to be seen every day, from 9 o'clock in the morning, till 9 at night.

October 14, 1802.

THE subscribers inform their friends and the public that they dissolved partnership on the 20th September, and request that those to whom they are indebted will furnish their accounts, and those on whom they have demands will please call on Robert Baker, who is authorized to settle the same when called upon.

JOHN HOGE.
ROBERT BAKER.

Pittsburgh, October 6, 1802.

ROBT. R. BAKER respectfully informs the public that the business will be continued by him in the same place, and hopes for the continuance of his friends.

NOTICE.

WHEREAS the subscriber gave sundry Bonds to Edward Drake, in consideration of a Tract of Land, and whereas the said Drake has not fulfilled his agreement with me, I therefore forwarn all persons from taking an assignment on said Bonds, as I am determined not to pay them until he compleats his bargain with me.

WILLIAM RAMBOW.

Allegheny County, October 13 1802.

From the New York EVENING POST.

JEFFERSON & CALLENDER.

No. XII.

The delay of this number so long, has arisen, not from that miserable indifference to the state of our public affairs, which too many endeavour to conceal under the name of a discreet moderation, nor from that shameful indolence which would fain take shelter in a pretended love of quiet, but solely from a desire to do justice to the subject, by bestowing on it all that patient research, that dispassionate investigation, which it must on all hands be allowed to demand.

It is our belief that in ordering the fine of 200 dollars to be repaid to James T. Callender, after it had been levied by the marshal and had of course become legally *vested* in the United States, the President has assumed a prerogative unknown to the constitution: It has therefore become our duty to *arraign this case at the bar of public reason.* And while we shall studiously avoid any uncandid construction, or indecorous license, no considerations shall induce us to abstain from a free and decent enquiry.

It may not be improper here to provide against certain false and improper impressions which might tend to lessen that degree of undivided attention which we must invite, as absolutely essential to a right understanding of the subject before us. There are doubtless many well disposed persons who will be apt to consider chiefly the amount of the fine itself, and to exclaim with the poet, *Rejice hæc! lana caprina.** They may imagine a mere 200 dollars to be too paltry a sum to attract much notice or cause any serious alarm. But let it be forever remembered, that in all constitutional questions, it is the principle, not the amount of the sum in controversy, which is to be taken into account. Usurpations of every kind are introduced with the greater facility, when in their first attempts, they are too frivial to arrest attention, or when they are cloaked under the plausible pretext of public utility. Once introduced, however, we are soon awakened to behold a gigantic monster, who with his foot on the earth and his head in the clouds† becomes too firm and formidable ever to be moved.—For exercise of a *Letter de Cachet*, in a few preliminary instances of known and detestable crimes, may have led to the establishment of the Bastile, and all the horrors of discretionary imprisonment. On the other hand, the assumed prerogative of bestowing at the will of the monarch, moderate rewards on great services rendered the community, might smooth the way to the unlimited disposal of national property upon the corrupt favourers of arbitrary power. When Charles the first was unhappily induced to violate the constitution by his unauthorised exaction of ship money, the celebrated John Hambden made a great and glorious opposition; renowned in the annals of all succeeding ages; his resistance cost him an ample fortune; yet the sum demanded was only a few shillings. The amount claimed was certainly no object, but the principle contended for involved the liberties and constitution of his country; and he made a noble stand in their behalf, which has given a splendor to his name that no time can diminish. Thus, to come down to our own times, the trifling duty of three pence a pound upon tea, was a matter altogether insignificant when set in comparison with the toils, the dangers, the blood and treasure which was to be the price of a revolution. But an Otis, an Adams, a Hancock, a Warren, Quincey and a Molineaux, sat not down with Pike's arithmetic before them to calculate the exact amount which an opposition was to cost. When it became a question between "economy in the public expense" and principle, they were not to be deterred by an impotent apprehension that it would *take from the mouth of labour* some of the bread *it had earned.* The admission of a right to tax and bind America by law in all cases whatsoever, could not be endured—it involved principles repugnant to constitutional rights and subversive of freedom. This was the great consideration which impelled them forward and taught them to spurn at those obstacles which with weaker or less patriotic men would have been insurmountable. History will inscribe their names in the same roll with that of Hambden and Pym.

In the language then of a nervous writer, "Let me exhort and conjure you, my fellow citizens never to suffer an invasion of your political constitution, however minute the instance may appear, to pass by without a determined persevering resistance. One precedent creates another. They soon accumulate and constitute law. What yesterday was fact, to day is doctrine. Examples are supposed to justify the most dangerous measures and where they do not suit exactly, the defect is supplied by analogy. This is not the cause of faction, or of party, or of any individual, but the common interest of every man in America. If the constitutional powers of the president did not in the case we are about to consider, extend to the restitution of the fine which had been levied, or if the pardon as issued was not legally competent to produce the affect ascribed to it, then the constitution of the country has been violated, and if it may be violated with impunity in one instance, what security have we for its future safety?

Having made these preliminary remarks, we come now more immediately to the subject of the present number.

In order to avoid being perplexed with useless controversy, and losing sight of the principal question, let us here state the leading features of the case itself.

On the 28th of May, 1800. James Thompson Callender was legally convicted of a misdemeanor, and sentenced to pay a fine of 200 dollars, to be imprisoned nine months, and find security for his good behaviour for a certain term "beyond the expiration of his imprisonment," shortly after Callender had paid the fine into the hands of the marshal, and after the term of his imprisonment had expired, a general pardon of the misdemeanor, *remitting and releasing all pains and penalties incurred or to be incurred by reason thereof*, was granted and sent to the marshal. Doubts were suggested whether, having once received the money from Callender, the officer could legally pay it back to him. These doubts were communicated to the acting secretary of state, who, after a delay of nearly a month, replied, that the question had been considered, and that "before a fine is paid into the treasury, a pardon remits and restores it to the party," concluding with a direction to the marshal, to "restore the money to Mr. Callender," which was accordingly done.

On this statement it will be maintained —*First*, that the president had no power to restore the fine after it had been levied. *Second*, admitting him to be possessed of the right, yet that a *charter* of *pardon* simply, like the one in this case, could not, without express words of restitution, have that operation. If I am successful in my attempt to establish these propositions, it will follow, that Mr. Jefferson has exceeded his constitutional powers, and violated the laws of his country. Surely this subject is interesting, although the investigation may be tedious; but however I may fail to amuse the multitude of readers, I flatter myself I shall receive the serious and candid attention of all men of reflection.

In discussing these two points, I shall confine myself strictly to the facts, leaving to another opportunity a more particular enquiry into the president's motives. For the present, I shall take it for granted, that he was actually influenced by those ascribed to him, in the papers *devoted* to his defence particularly that printed at Worcester, under the immediate care and direction of the attorney general; a desire to evince his opposition to the sedition act as an unconstitutional law. He is welcome to all the benefits to be derived from such a defence; and in truth he must take up with this, or resort to one equally unjustifiable, and far more disgraceful. But to return—

First. *The president has no power to restore a fine once levied.* The people of the United States, when they adopted the national constitution, not only directed that all executive powers should be vested in a president, but they defined and limited those powers in the instrument itself: No power therefore can be legally exercised by him unless given by express provision, or resulting by fair construction. I am no advocate for the diminution of those powers; I would be the last man to desire to place a limitation on the salutary prerogatives of the executive; I consider them essentially necessary to the welfare and happiness of the people, and I would not by any forced inference attempt in any shape to abridge them. But notwithstanding the liberality of this disposition, I am, and ever shall be, rigidly tenacious of the principle by which those powers are to be tested. We are to be governed by the constitution as we find it, not as it might be modified. If the powers of the executive are too narrow, extend them by amendment, but not by a violation of the instrument,—Till that is done we must take it as it is.

After the most careful examination of the constitution, I can find no clause expressly authorising the executive to order the *restitution of a fine* and thus *divest* the U. S. of monies once legally vested by a payment to one of their officers, for their use. Since then the constitution contains no express provision of this sort, it remains only to enquire if any such power exists by fair implication? And here again I have to confess, that I can find no word or phrase which can be even brought to bear at all on the subject, except the single clause which confers on the President the right to grant reprieves and pardons. And we are thus brought to the single consideration, whether the power to *pardon* offences necessarily implies a power of *restitution.*

The term *pardon*, in the English law books is applicable to various subjects. There the crown may pardon not only crimes and misdemeanors, but debts; and by a seperate and distinct prerogative, may award restitution of goods and chattels or lands forfeited; here however, the power of the president is expressly limited to the granting "*reprieves and pardons for offences against the United States, except in cases of impeachment.*" The question therefore resolves itself precisely into this; whether a right to pardon implies in its very essence, a power to restore a fine imposed, and already paid.

In England, all fines make a part of the ordinary revenue of the crown, and are paid into the exchequer for the sole use of the king, who is the sole proprietor or possessor thereof, and who may therefore order restitution. But even there, although in the words of Blackstone, "the effect of a *pardon* simply is to make the offender a new man; to acquit him of all *corporal penalties and forfeitures** annexed to that offence for which he obtains his pardon," yet all this, we shall presently see, will not operate to *restore* a fine without express *words of restitution.* In this country fines are not paid into the exchequer for the use of the President, but into the treasury for the use of the United States. The theory of our government never once contemplated a power in the executive over the treasury, in any shape. And here it is we take the material distinction, in reference to this subject, between the King of Great-Britain and the President of the United States. It may now, perhaps, be proper, before we go any further, to examine the English law more particularly as to the power of the crown to grant pardons. I hold it to have been long since indisputably settled by a course of authorities, that where *the subject or subjects generally, have an interest in the fine, there the crown cannot interpose to order restitution.* To this point authorities shall be produced.

"A pardon does not discharge a thing

---

* *Let them dispute about straws.*

† *Ingreditarque solo, et caput inter nubila condit.* *Virgil.*

* *The words made use of by the President are 'all pains and penalties.'*

which the subject has a property or in rest." Resolved 5 Co. 31. a 3 Mod. 56 o. Car. 357. 8.

"A penalty upon a conviction for deer-aling is not discharged by a pardon, for is a forfeiture to the party grieved, and he th an interest in the penalty." Semb. 1. alk. 383. 4.

"The Crown's share only of a forfeiture pardoned by an act of general pardon."—emp. Ann. Parker 280.

"After an action popular, brought *tam o domino quam pro seipso*, according to any atute, the king cannot discharge but his vn part, and cannot discharge the inform-'s part." 3 Co. Ins. 238. Str. 530, 1272. Geo. II.

Thus we see, that while the law allows e King his full prerogative where he alone concerned, it is scrupulously vigilant that shall never exercise it where it in any nner interferes with the rights of others; d although it cannot exclude the preroga-ve of pardon, it may prevent the exercise the other prerogative of *restitution* from companying the pardon. The King can ly restore money which belongs to himself; at in which no one else has an interest; t in the theory of our government it is not ce contemplated that any part of the pub-money belongs to the Executive. Rea-ning therefore by fair analogy from the ses above cited, it follows, that as the U-ted States have the sole interest in the pe-lty levied, the President can have no right order it restored, or in any way to inter-re with it. But we are not even left to in-rence on this important subject: When ce a fine is levied, it becomes a *vested* part the national revenue, and subject to the sposition of Congress only; to whom alone l power of this nature is expressly entrust-d by the constitution. "*No money shall be wn from the Treasury, but in consequence f appropriation made by law.*" Could words re strong be found to guard public pro-erty? I am induced, however, to believe at the attorney-general, the then secreta-y of state, pro tem. must have founded his inion on this very clause: I fancy, that on oking at this phrase, the notion occurred him that before a fine is paid into the easury, a pardon remits and *restores* it to e party. I am at a loss, indeed, to con-ecture upon what other ground he has at-empted the distinction between money paid nto the treasury and money paid to officers, who, by receiving it, become accountable or it to the treasury. The supposed novel-y of the question, one would imagine, must aturally have excited his attention; its im-portance in an abstract view, could hardly ave escaped him, and the responsibility of is situation, as counsellor of the President n all important law suits, must have impos-d upon him as his duty to examine it with he most cautious deliberation. Yet, after ll, it will be found, that he has proceeded pon a distinction without any solid differ-nce. The constitution supposed that all monies belonging to the public, would be paid into the treasury; and for greater cau-ion, meant by this clause to guard against nwarranted appropriations. It was taken for granted that no indirect applications for money would be made to any of its collect-ng officers, and therefore that it would be sufficient to admonish those who acted in the treasury, that they would not be justified in paying out money without an express legal appropriation. The doctrine, however, now contended for would render all such provisi-ons perfectly nugatory. Vain, indeed, has been this caution; idle all the preventative wisdom of the framers of our constitution, if the President of the United States can dis-pose of the public money as he pleases, at any time before it reaches the national trea-sury. This is to render him the absolute and incontroulable governor, if not proprietor of all the public revenues. If it is law to proceed as he has done in the case before us, he may cancel all the custom-house bonds, or issue his warrants to the collectors of the customs and supervisors of the revenue, and dispose of whatever public money is in their hands, any time before it is lodged in the coffers of the treasury. What would be the consequences of such a doctrine, and how fairly it may be inferred from the opinion of the Attorney General, the American nation must judge.

We come now to the second proposition, namely, admitting the President to be pos-sessed of the right, yet that a charter of pardon without *words of restitution*, could not operate to restore the money. It will be perceived that here I am at issue with the Attorney General, who after several weeks consideration delivered it as his o-pinion "That before a fine is paid into the treasury, a pardon remits and restores it to the party." In a case of this public mo-ment, however, we hope we shall stand ex-cused, if we undertake to examine for our-selves, what the law may be uninfluenced by [illegible] of exalted station. And in di-rect contradiction to this great law-officer, I shall maintain, that when a fine is once paid it having become property vested, a charter of pardon does not imply its *restitution*, To establish this doctrine the following authorities are conceived to be directly in point.

"In error on outlawry pronounced upon in-dictment of murder, it was assigned for error that at the capias the king pardoned *all that in him is, all chattles and possessions*; and pray-ed that the outlawry be reversed, and that he have his chattels; and the judgment was reversed, *but he did not re-have* his goods, for it seems that it ought to be by *words of res-titution*, and not by words of *pardon*." Br. Charters de pardon pl. 73, cites 9 H. 5. 14. 15.

"A *pardon* of an outlawry for felony, does not restore his goods or lands, forfeited by the outlawry, without *words of restitution*." 2 Rol. Ab. 179 l. 15.

"A man is indicted of a trespass and outlawed at the suit of the king: *& Rex par-donavit utlagarium in cum promulgatum, et quicquid ad eum pertinet*, and notwithstanding the defendant *shall make fine*, for it seemeth that these words *quicquid ad eum pertinet*, without any reference, are too general to dispense with the fine." 3 Ins. 239.

"A pardon of all forfeitures will not di-vest an interest vested in the king." 3 Mod. 2 Jac. 2 B.

"As no pardon from the king shall divest any interest vested in the subject; so nei-ther shall it without words of restitution, even divest any thing from the king." Lev. 8. 120. 2. Mod. 53. Saund. 302. 3 Mod. 111 Bac. 5. 296.

"If a man outlawed at the suit of the party be pardoned of the outlawry, yet he is not restored to his goods thereby: For the pardon shall not give restitution of goods." Br. Charters de pardon pl. 11.

"Pardon by the king, without express words of restitution, shall not divest, either from the king or subject an interest, either in lands or goods, vested in them by an at-tainder or conviction precedent." 2 Hawk. Pl. C. 296. cap. 37. 3. 54.

It must be remembered that the general doctrine is, that a pardon acquits of "all corporal penalties and forfeitures annexed to the offence," yet we see it expressly adjudg-ed that without specific words of restitution, no pardon can restore a fine levied. After observing the uniform current of authorities, I confess myself utterly at a loss to conceive in what way the president or the secretary of state, or the attorney general will attempt to support the opinion which has been given and acted upon. No lawyer will contend that any words or phrase in the pardon is-sued by the President, amount to words of restitution, but if any common reader should incline to such an opinion, it may be observ-ed, that the attorney general himself has saved us the trouble of shewing that they do not, for he places the question precisely on the footing, that "a pardon of itself re-mits and restores a fine to the party." In-deed it would have been in vain to have laid any stress upon the terms made use of by the President, for we have seen it decided, that the same, and much broader phraseolo-gy is held not to comprehend terms of res-titution.

Thus then, unless I am entirely mistaken in the correctness and applicability of the law, and in my conscience I believe I am not, it appears, first, that the President was not empowered to order the restitution of the fine; and secondly, that if he was, yet he has not in his charter of pardon made use of apt, legal words sufficient for such purpose. It therefore follows, that here has been not only an assumption of prero-gative unknown to the constitution, but a daring attempt to ascribe to an official act of the executive an effect directly in the face of the law. This, however ought not, per-haps, so much to excite surprise, for when one branch of the government has the profli-gate audacity to attempt to mark with deri-sion a public statute, which had been regu-larly and formally enacted, it certainly can have little scruple to trample on all those forms, which the wisdom of our ancestors has established.

I have now completed the task I assigned myself. It may be expected, perhaps, by those who remember that the eventual pay-ment of the fine, was the purchase of a sup-pression of Callender's threatened narrative of the whole transaction, that some obser-vations will be made on the everlasting dis-grace to which Mr. Jefferson has exposed himself, by the evident motives which in-duced him to persist in ordering the repay-ment of the fine, after those doubts as to his legal powers had been fairly laid before him. But all remarks of this sort will find a place in the editorial paragraphs of the day; it is desirable that no considerations of a personal nature should mix themselves with this great constitutional question. We shall be atten-tive to the first answer which may appear from any quarter, of sufficient respectability to entitled it to our notice, and it shall meet with an early attention. A fair, full and candid discussion shall be had; nay, it shal be continued and repeated at every oppor-tunity, and in every attitude, till the grea body of the people perfectly comprehen the subject, even in all its remote conse-quences!

It remains to be seen whether those in power, can by fair words and plausible pro-fessions, seduce the American nation to yield to direct and daring usurpation.

LONDON, *August* 29.

We received this morning the Paris papers to the 24th instant. They are full of impor-tant intelligence.

On Saturday last Bonaparte repaired with extraordinary magnificence to the Senate which held its first sitting in the form and man-ner established by the Organic Senatus Con-sultum. Several plans of Senatus Con-sulta, discussed in a Privy Council, were pre-sented to the Senate. One of them relates to the selection of twenty principal cities of the Republic, the mayors of which are to be present at the taking of the oath by the Ci-tizen who should be named to succeed the First Consul. It may be inferred from this, that the successor will soon be declared. The Minister for Foreign Affairs then read a report upon the indemnities, and the de-claration agreed by Russia, and France, to be presented to the Diet of Ratisbon.

This declaration contains a detailed and specific account of the particular indemnities, to be granted to each of the German States.

There are to be three new Electors, the Margrave of Baden, Duke of Wirtemberg and the Landgrave of Hesse Cassel. There is to be one Ecclesiastical Elector.

The Bishopric of Osnaburgh is to belong in perpetuity to the Elector of Hanover, if he abandons his pretensions to Hildesheim, Corvey and Hoexter, and other districts.

Toussaint Louverture has been ordered to Paris, under a strong escort of dragoons.

Upon the seizure and stoppage of the En-glish newspapers at Paris, the French Jour-nals are totally silent; but our Dover letter confirms the intelligence.

A mail from Lisbon arrived this morning, and has brought the extraordinary, intelli-gence that in consequence of some misun-derstanding between the French and Portu-guese Governments, Gen. Lasnes, the French Minister at the latter Court, quitted Lisbon very hastily on the morning of the 10th inst. in consequence the packet was detained two days longer than she otherwise would have staid. The Portuguese appeared to be much alarmed at his sudden departure.

The quarrel is said to have been occasi-oned by the Portuguze Minister of Police having insisted on searching some baggage belonging to the French Minister, who re-monstrated to the Court of Portugal, and e-ven insisted on the dismissal of the Minister of Police, which being refused, he immedi-ately quitted Lisbon for Paris.

NEW-YORK, *October* 11.

The Iris, on her homeward passage, spoke a vessel from Lisbon, the captain of which informed him that the differences between the United States and the Emperor of Mo-rocco were accommodated amicably.

RUPTURE WITH PORTUGAL.

Respecting the sudden departure of the French Minister from the Court of Portugal as mentioned in the two last number of the Mercantile Advertiser, the following article appears in the official Gazette of Lisbon:

"*Lisbon 14th, August.*

"General Lasnes, envoy extraordinary, and minister plenipotentiary of the French republic, left this Court in the morning of the 10th instant; a measure which he took from his own proper will, and which is the more unexpected, as constant and repeated civilities and attentions have been paid to him by this Court, in demonstration of the constant friendship, perfect harmony, and good understanding subsisting between this monarchy and the French republic; as there does not exist any actual object of discussi-on between the two governments which can alter, in the smallest degree, the happy re-lations of this country with France, relations which this Court desires efficaciously to pro-mote, and even to render more intimate.

PHILADELPHIA, *October* 11.

It is a fact highly honorable to the charac-ters of the American masters of vessels, that out of fifteen or twenty laying in the port of Havre de Grace, it was with extreme diffi-culty that *one* could be persuaded to accept Tom Paine on any terms, as a passenger.—We have authority to say that three belong-ing to this port, rejected him, in terms of dis-gust and indignation.—Captain Auld who arrived yesterday, informs us, he had experi-enced a refusal from several others and be-lieves, that he had at last succeeded with the ship London Packet, which was to sail for Baltimore a few days after th[illegible] No wonder that our Pious Pre[illegible] it expedient to dispatch a fri[illegible] commodation of this loathsom[illegible]

LOUISVILLE, (K.) S[illegible]

We are informed that the t[illegible] Indians is concluded, and that G[illegible] risson has succeeded in purc[illegible] quantity of valuable lands—als[illegible] square to include the Saline L[illegible] next we hope to be able to giv[illegible] ticular account of this interesting

---

The Pittsburgh Ga[illegible]

FRIDAY EVENING, *October*[illegible]

The following persons were [illegible] the General Election, on the 12th [illegible]

For the District composed of the c[illegible] Allegheny, Crawford, &c.

Congress.—John B. C. Lucas.

ALLEGHENY COUNTY.

Assembly—Samuel Ewalt, Abner [illegible] and John M'Masters.

Commissioner—James Martin.

CRAWFORD COUNTY.

Assembly—John Lytle, jun.

WASHINGTON COUNTY.

Congress—William Hoge.

Senator— —— Lyle.

Assembly—Messrs. Marshall, Kee[illegible] new and Vance.

For Fayette and Greene Counties.

Congress—John Smilie.

GREENE COUNTY.

Assembly—Isaac Weaver.

FAYETTE COUNTY.

Senator—Presley Carr Lane.

Assembly—Charles Porter, J. Cunningha[illegible] and Samuel Trevor.

For Westmoreland, Armstrong and Somer-set Counties.

Congress—William Findley.

WESTMORELAND COUNTY.

Assembly—James Brady, James Montge-mery and Henry Allshouse.

Commissioner—James Parr.

The importance of the subject matter has induced us to select from the New-York Herald the concluding number of essays, en-titled "Jefferson and Callender." We re-gret not having had room or leisure to re-print the whole of Mr. Coleman's, publicati-ons under the above head. As to the last number, scarcely any apology could excuse us for not giving it all the circulation that it can possibly obtain through our medium. It is so complete a refutation of the mon-strous doctrine, contended for by the mini-sterialists who defend the remission of Callen-der's fine, that it well deserves the attention of all the friends to constitutonal freedom.

OHIO COMPANY.

THE situation of a country is truly de-plorable, when the most salutary measures for promoting public good and genuine pros-perity, cannot escape the rancourous attacks of party rage and personal animosity.

The scheme which has lately been pub-lished for instituting this Company, has been conceived in the pure spirit of benevolence and patriotism. It must strike every unpre-judiced mind, that public good and the love of country are its most prominent features; and although it has been basely suggested that it was ushered forth at the eve of the election for serving unworthy purposes, yet perhaps, there never was a more suita[illegible] crisis for holding out encouragement and relief to the present desponding state of the country. Its author is a man of tale[illegible] sound judgment and clear discernment, has an experimental knowledge of the [illegible] of the Mississippi, and has been the fir[illegible] discover its present embarrassments, [illegible] point out a remedy. His commercial co[illegible] nections are considerable, and his infor[illegible] tion will be always accurate and correct.

I have heard the opinion of a great [illegible] sensible, intelligent, well informed men on this subject, and from common re[illegible] have reason to believe, that every em[illegible] ment and profession, no matter what [illegible] party or politics may be, do warmly ap[illegible] and will embrace it as a plan obviously [illegible] culated to promote the interest of eve[illegible] dividual. Notwithstanding this general [illegible] currence of sentiment and intelligent opi[illegible] upon a subject so highly interesting [illegible] yet strange to find, that in a late paper [illegible] ed the *Tree*, some malignant spirit has [illegible] made the willing instrument of party [illegible] by indulging itself in condemning the [illegible] and venting hostility against Gen. Wi[illegible] as the author.

But this is only a flimsy veil thrown [illegible] the true cause of hostility. This gentle[illegible] has the honour of being a distinguished [illegible] deral Republican, and possessing the co[illegible] dence of the most respectable part of [illegible] community, he consequently becomes a